

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪ್ರಭಾಕರ್ (ನಲಮಂಗಲ-ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಜಾತಿಗಳು).—ಹಿಂದಿನ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ 15 ನೆಯ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಇನ್ನೂ ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಕಾರಣವೇನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿರಾ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I need not assign any reasons.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಫ್. ಸಿ. ನಾಗಯ್ಯರೆಡ್ಡಿ (ಗೋರಿಬಿದನೂರು).—ಒಂದು point of information. ಈ ಅದಿವೇಶನದಲ್ಲಿ ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿರುವ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಿದರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿ.

Sri D. DEVARAJ URS (Hunsur).—I had sent a short notice question with regard to the removal of railway line on the bridge of Krishnarajasagar.

Mr. SPEAKER.—They have not yet sent their answer.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಸಿ. ಅಂಜನೇಯರೆಡ್ಡಿ (ಚಿಂತಾಮಣಿ).—ಚಿಂತಾಮಣಿ ಅಕ್ಯುಪೇಷನ್ ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಟಿನ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ಒಂದು short notice ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ನಾನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದೆ. ಅದೇನಾಯಿತು?

Mr. SPEAKER.—You should have sent it in time. It cannot be treated as a short notice question. It is disallowed.

### District Board Elections.

\*Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY (Chitaldrug).—I would like to draw the attention of this House through you to a report published in some of the local papers that the District Board elections may be postponed till about April and that the Government or the ruling party is thinking of some amendments to the existing Act. I would like to know whether the Government had promised definitely that the elections to the District Boards would be held by about the end of August 1953 and whether the reconsidered the decision or the promise held out to this House and whether they are really thinking of amending the Act, if so on what lines. The House may be enlightened on this point.

\*Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—Sir, the history of the District

Board Bill reveals certain very interesting features, both regarding administration and party and local politics. When Government promises a certain thing, they must implement it. When they go back on their promise, they must assign satisfactory reasons. But they should not take us by surprise. The District Board Bill looks as if.....

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO (Minister for Law and Education).—On a point of order, Sir, whether any discussion on a point which is not in the form of a motion can take place.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is true. But this is a matter of public importance. In view of this, I feel that if the Government so desire, they may make a statement. Otherwise, they need not.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Thank you very much, Sir.

If I go back a little into the history of this Bill, a Committee was appointed under the chairmanship of Sri V. Venkatappa, the then Speaker, which drafted its recommendations. Those recommendations were accepted by the then Government. They brought a Bill before this House and it was accepted; the Village Panchayets and District Board Act became law. It was about to be implemented when the Ministry was changed and the present Ministry came into office. For some reason or other, the present Ministry wanted to make a drastic change regarding the mode of elections. The original Bill contemplated indirect elections in order to save undue expenditure and also to establish a sort of co-ordination between the Village Panchayets and the District Boards. But the present Ministry sought to introduce direct adult franchise for the election of the members. This was hotly resented by the Opposition. We staged a walk out in protest. Perhaps, realising their folly the Government gave up further attempts to introduce adult franchise and they gave up that measure. For subsequent questions put in this House, the Minister

for Education and other Ministers have assured us that elections to the District Boards were long over due and would take place by August. So preparations were made. Lists were prepared. Recently legislation was introduced in this House empowering the Government to prepare electoral lists on the model of the lists prepared for the Legislative Council and when all these things were made and when the Amildars and the Deputy Commissioners were asked to go on with this work, another bomb-shell comes through the papers now. It is stated that the legislative members of the Congress Party again do not want an indirect system of elections and that they want to go back to the direct system of elections. This is nasty and this sort of dirty politics...

\***Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA** (Minister for Home and Industries).—Sir, I raise a further point of order. I am under the impression that if anybody has to raise a discussion, it should be according to the rules framed by this House.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—Which is that rule?

**Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.**—Under Rule 115 of the Mysore Legislative Assembly Rules, it is to be seen: "Save in so far as is otherwise provided by the Constitution or by these rules, no discussion of a matter of general public interest shall take place otherwise than on a resolution moved in accordance with the rules governing the moving of resolution, except on a motion made with the consent of the Speaker, who, if he admits the motion will allot a day or days for its discussion in consultation with the Leader of the House."

This is the only rule, so far as I can see, that guides the discussion of a nature on which the Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition is making a speech now. Otherwise, the Government will be taken by surprise and it will not be possible to know what reply will have to be given if at the spur of the moment the Leader of the Opposition raises some point.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—I may inform the House that this sort of discussion is usual in England. I have gone through the records of Parliamentary proceedings and I find this. The only limitation is that the member is expected to inform the Speaker beforehand and the Minister concerned also.

In view of its public importance, as I have already stated, and also in view of the Bill being passed and in view of the several answers made that these elections would take place during the month of August 1953, I thought that this matter can be discussed. But the Government is not bound to answer. It is left to them, if they so desire, to make a statement. Otherwise, they need not.

**Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.**—I said that such an attitude on the part of the Government does not do them credit. Such inconsistent policies.....

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—The Hon'ble Member is using very strong language. It is unwarranted and uncalled for.

**Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.**—Well, Sir, when the Government make an assurance, when they declare a policy, they must stand by it. They must pursue it. When there is a sudden change of policy, then, they must consult the House. They must bring it openly before the House and give the reasons for the sudden change of policy. We now understand, as reported in the papers, that certain members of the Legislature Congress Party have brought a resolution in their meeting; and, they want that necessary amendments should be made to the Act which is already passed. This, I may state, is an attempt to suit their own conveniences for the furtherance of their party politics... ..

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—I think that will do. You have gained your object of bringing the question to the notice of the Government. If the Government so choose, they can assign reasons. Otherwise, they need not. I cannot compel the Government to make a statement.

**Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.**—Sir, this subject has been brought before us as a surprise. But, yet, I will answer the question. This point has been before the public and it is being agitated from a long time. There are two questions involved: one is the necessity and usefulness of the District Boards Act and the other the introduction of indirect elections. On that, the opinion in the country, both in Mysore as well as outside, has not crystalised itself. That is the unfortunate position. Perhaps, my friend knows that the District members now want direct elections. That is the latest information. Parties like papers can express their opinion to convince the Government. But to criticise that this is bad, I think, is not proper and not constitutional. If in response to public demand, Government feel that there is any necessity for changes, they will bring it before the House. Then, Hon'ble Members can criticise. But I am sorry for the unnecessary and unconstitutional allegations made here.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ (ತುರುವೇಕೆರೆ).—ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿನ ಮುನಿಸಿಪಲ್ ಚುನಾವಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮುಂದೆ ಹಾಕುತ್ತೀರಾ ?

(ಉತ್ತರವಿಲ್ಲ.)

## PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE.

STATEMENT SHOWING THE PROMISES  
MADE AND ACTION TAKEN THEREON  
BY THE GOVERNMENT

**Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO** (Minister for Law and Education).—Sir, I lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the promises made by the Government during the previous sessions of the Legislative Assembly

and action taken thereon, copies of which have already been distributed to Members.

**Sri M. V. RAMA RAO** (Tumkur).—With regard to the statement that has been laid on the Table

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—Copies of the Statement were also distributed and it has been placed on the Table.

**Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.**—I find from a perusal of the copy that only a few of the assurances that have been given from time to time by the Government during the previous sessions have been implemented. The statement, so far as my own personal recollection is concerned of those assurances, does not cover the numerous assurances given by Government during the Question Time and during the course of other proceedings of the House during the past three sessions. What I wanted to know was whether Government are in a position to inform this House if this Statement that has been placed on the Table of the House contains all that Government have done or intend to do with regard to those assurances or whether there is any Supplementary Statement that would be forthcoming later on.

**Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.**—If there are any other promises remaining, certainly they will be attended to.

## NON-OFFICIAL BUSINESS— BILLS

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—Is Sri G. A. Thimmappa Gowda moving his Bill ?

**Sri G. A. THIMMAPPA GOWDA** (Arkalgud).—For the present, I do not move the Bill.